

Remarks

In a Final Office Action mailed February 19, 2008, on page 2 in paragraph 2, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-33 and 35-37 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by United States Patent Application Publication No. 2006/0265689 to Kuznetsov et al.

On page 16 the Examiner rejected Claims 34 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuznetsov further in view of United States Patent No. 7,181,412 to Fulgoni et al.

In the “Response to Arguments,” on page 17, in paragraph 33, the Examiner stated that “Applicant’s arguments filed 11/30/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to applicant’s arguments, the recitation, ‘a method for accelerating delivery of requested secure webpages,’ has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble.”

On page 18 in paragraph 34 the Examiner continued, “Further, the limitations found within independent claims 1, 14 and 26 are broadly interpreted by the Examiner to be disclosed by Kuznetsov.”

Some amendments to the claims are made for clarity in order to establish better consistency with terminology used in the specification. The term “intermediating” now precedes the term “device” in claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 14, 16, 17, 18, 26, 28, 30, 33, 34, 36, and 37 and is supported in the specification as-filed on page 4 in line 7 and in Figs. 2 and 3. The term “client proxy” is added to claim 2 and is supported in the specification as-filed on page 4 in line 5 and in Figs. 2 and 3. The term “request” is changed to “link” in claims 4 and 5. The term “encoder” is added to claim 11 and supported on page 7 lines 11-21 and in original claim 11. The term “decoder” is added to claim 11 and supported on page 7 line 22 and in original claim 11.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

On page 2 the Examiner rejected independent claims 1, 14, and 26 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application 2006/0265689 to Kuznetsov et al. (“*Kuznetsov*”). Regarding the independent claims 1, 14, and (26) the Examiner stated on pages 2, 8, and 11 respectively “Kuznetsov teaches a method (system) for *accelerating delivery of requested secure webpages* comprising . . . ‘*URL re-writing*’ . . . ‘*rewriting URLs in an HTTP header*’ . . . ‘*transformation of pre-transform data according to a transformation function*’ . . . [and] *returning the request to its original format*.” (Emphasis added.) Applicant respectfully traverses.

In order to anticipate a claim, a reference must teach all elements of a claim. See Verdegaal Bros., Inc. v. Union Oil Co., 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987). In addition, the reference must show the claimed invention “in as complete detail as is contained in the patent claim.” Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., Ltd., 868 F.2d 1226, 1236 (Fed. Cir. 1989). See *id.* Applicant will show that the cited reference fails to teach each claimed limitation in as complete detail as Applicant’s currently amended independent claims 1, 14, and 26. Therefore, the claims are not anticipated and are thus novel.

Applicant’s currently amended independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, “rewriting . . . original format links in first webpages identifying secure webpages so that any request for a secure webpage made by referencing a rewritten link will be recognized” Independent claim 14 recites “rewriting any link to a secure webpage such that a request . . . made by referencing the rewritten link will be recognized” Independent claim 26 recites “. . . means for rewriting links, to any secure webpage in a webpage requested by the client, from an original format . . . such that the client’s request . . . will be recognized . . .” The Examiner cited three references on page 2 paragraph 1 regarding *Kuznetsov* teaching “URL re-writing,” “rewriting URLs in an HTTP header,” and “transformation of pre-transform data according to a transformation function.” More specifically, *Kuznetsov* teaches that the “markup processor can optionally performing [sic, perform] additional data

processing such as, for example . . . URL re-writing.” (See *Kuznetsov* at paragraph [0027].) *Kuznetsov* merely teaches “URL re-writing” as an option for processing markup language. *Kuznetsov* teaches that “the message 140 arrives at the markup language processing device such that transformation of pre-transform data according to a transformation function . . . of a transformation in the sequence of transformations commences during streaming and prior to completely receiving the entire message.” (See *Kuznetsov* at paragraph [0097].) Here, *Kuznetsov* merely teaches *when* the markup language processing device processes markup. *Kuznetsov* is silent with regard to *what might be done* with a re-written URL, much less claim 1’s limitation of “. . . so that any request for a secure webpage made by referencing a rewritten link will be recognized . . .”; claim 14’s limitation of “. . . such that a request . . . made by referencing the rewritten link will be recognized . . .”; or claim 26’s limitation “. . . such that the client’s request . . . will be recognized . . .” Thus, *Kuznetsov* fails to teach this element of the independent claims.

Claim 1 as amended recites “returning the rewritten link to its original format . . .” Claim 14 as amended recites “returning the rewritten link in the request to its original format . . .” Claim 26 as amended recites “returning the rewritten link to the original format . . .” In response to the Examiner’s reference on page 3 in paragraph 1(b) regarding “returning the request to its original format,” Applicant notes that *Kuznetsov* teaches that “the markup language processing device 120 operates in a loopback mode . . . and forwards a return message 150 back to the same computerized device 110. The return message 150 . . . may be the same content as was in the original message.” (See *Kuznetsov* at paragraph [0128].) *Kuznetsov* merely teaches an ability of the markup language processing device to loop a message back to the source of the message in an unchanged condition. Therefore, *Kuznetsov* again fails to teach the details of Applicant’s currently amended independent claims 1, 14, or 26.

Further, claims 1, 14, and (26) as amended recite “to thereby accelerate delivery of a (the) requested secure webpage . . .” In contrast, *Kuznetsov* says nothing about accelerating delivery of requested secure webpages. Therefore, *Kuznetsov* once more fails to anticipate any of the independent claims 1, 14, or 26.

As Applicant has shown, *Kuznetsov* does not teach Applicant's currently amended independent claim 1, 14, and 26 limitations relating to 1) rewriting links so that requests for secure webpages will be recognized; 2) returning the rewritten link to its original format; or 3) to thereby accelerate delivery of the requested secure webpages. *Kuznetsov* therefore cannot and does not anticipate Applicant's currently amended independent claims 1, 14, and 26, and thus the claims are allowable. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claims 1, 14, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). Moreover, since claims 2-13, 15-25, and 27-38 depend from claims 1, 14, and 26 respectively, they too are allowable for at least the same reasons. Further, each of the dependent claims 2-13, 15-25, and 27-38 has its own limitations and/or features.

Conclusion

Applicant is amending claims 1-6, 11-14, 16-18, 20, and 23-38. Applicant shows that currently amended independent claims 1, 14, and 26 are not anticipated by the cited reference. Moreover, since claims 2-13, 15-25, and 27-38 depend either directly or indirectly from claims 1, 14, and 26 respectively, they too are allowable for at least the same reasons. Reconsideration and a Notice of Allowance are requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned with any comments or questions at 408-297-9733 between 9:00 AM and 5:00 PM PST.

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being transmitted via the Office electronic filing system in accordance with § 1.6(a)(4) on the date shown below.

Signed: _____

Typed Name: Sally Azevedo

Date: _____ April 10, 2008 _____

Respectfully submitted,



J. Eppa Hite

Reg. No. 30,266

Schneck & Schneck

P.O. Box 2-E

San Jose, CA 95109-0005

(408) 297-9733